

Who does not know that the old common law is the irreconcilable antagonist of slavery—that its touch is death to it—that, as a lawyer, as a legal scholar, as a jurist, as a statesman, as a legislator, as a politician, as a philosopher, as a moralist, as a Christian, as a man, he is bound to oppose the invasion of the principle of the common law; and who does not see that the construction claimed by the objectors, conflicts with all those great principles of the common law involved throughout the Constitution? Whereas, that construction which applies the clause to the just relations between persons under contract upon the basis of an equivalent for value rendered in perfect harmony with those principles, and which illustrates one of the noblest modes of operation.

Sparing further details under this head, enough has been said to show that such construction is in this clause of the Constitution as would apply its provisions to the perpetuation of slavery, and consequent to the subversion of liberty and the perdition of the soul, and that, in the face of the Constitution, and set against acknowledged principles, and against the objects and ends, solemnly set forth by the framers themselves.

It is not necessary to show that the clause made plain by the meaning of its words are confirmed by the consistency of meaning with the declared principles

whig party because its opinions are not their own; and it shows to our Northern Freeman, moreover, their wrong policy in allowing themselves with a

"There is, however, in the elements of Northern Democracy, what is utterly destructive of this social system, (slavery) and cannot permit it much longer to exist. On the contrary, the *Whig party*

legislature of this year—probably because they





